UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/777,119	02/13/2004	Jonathan Hui	03630.000199.1	5009	
5514 7590 12/11/2007 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO EXAMINER					
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			JUNG, DAVID YIUK		
NEW YORK, 1	NY 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2134		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

				_
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/777,119	HUI ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		David Y. Jung	2134	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address -	•
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communica (C) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pr		s is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 1-29 and 67 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-29,67 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	vn from consideration.		·
_				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the e Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority ι	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) [ a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)		
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **CLAIMS PRESENTED**

Claims 1-29, 67 are presented.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-29, 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SMIL and MHEG-5 (both cited in the previous Office Action).

As Applicant noted, these references explicitly state all features of the claims except for XML and the parent-child relationships.

Applicant asserts, based on the paper Applicant presents, that XML cannot be combined with these references and that XML cannot even be in the same field of endeavor. Applicant is wrong. XML was explicitly created for the very purpose to be applicable to a wide variety of areas such as the areas that were not yet well served by browsers (which was at one time dominated by HTML standard). The very XML committees worked to create such standard. The very field of endeavor in which Applicant's paper (from MHEG group) was one of the areas to which XML was to serve. True, XML did not always exist from the very beginning of visual arts. That fact cannot

Application/Control Number:

10/777,119 Art Unit: 2134

obscure the fact that XML is indeed the EXTENSIBLE markup language designed to explicitly go beyond the HTML limits. True, at one time, not everything in the visual arts was compatible with XML (as noted by Applicant). That fact cannot obscure the fact that the features of XML derive explicitly from the limits noted at the HTML era (as in the time of Applicant's MHEG paper) – XML was explicitly designed to go beyond those limits that were noted. In other words, the very existence of XML today disproves Applicant.

As for parent-child relationships, this is the standard relationship of data as usually set ("default" because the data relationships, such as in databases, were hierarchical before network or relational databases were introduced). Data that involve markup languages is no exception. Thus, this cannot be a point of novelty.

For these reasons, Applicant's arguments are not yet deemed persuasive.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide further arguments, affidavits,

amendments, or other appropriate measures.

For the <u>details</u> of the issues that are <u>no longer contested</u> (of which there are many), see the previous Office Action.

### Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number:

10/777,119

Art Unit: 2134

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

Page 4

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Points of Contact** 

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

Page 5

10/777,119 Art Unit: 2134

(571) 27<u>3</u>-3836 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (272) 272-3811.

**David Jung** 

Patent Examiner

12/9/07